

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending. In the Office Action mailed April 3, 2008, the drawings stand objected to due to component labeling that is allegedly not readable. Applicants provide herewith revised drawing sheets in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 (d). These revised drawing sheets include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet. The revised drawing sheets are labeled in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet" pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d). As such, Applicants respectively request that these drawing objections be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants' Abstract to the Specification stands objected to because it is allegedly not provided in a separate paragraph as required pursuant to M.P.E.P. 608.01(b). Applicants' have moved this Abstract to a separate paragraph at the end of Applicants' specification. Applicants respectively request, therefore, that is objection be withdrawn.

Currently, claims 1-15 stand objected due to various alleged informalities. With respect to the pending claims, claims 4, 6, 9, 13 and 15 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependent form. Applicants have revised these claims and respectively request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-10 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Cover et al. (US Patent No. 7,155,479) ("Cover 479"). Claims 2-3 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cover (US Patent No. 7,155,749) ("Cover 479") as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of what the Office Action calls Applicants allegedly admitted prior art ("APA").

Applicants respectively traverse. After a careful review of the Office Action, the cited references, and Applicants claim clarifications, Applicants respectively request reconsideration

in view of the following remarks.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4-10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Cover et al. (US Patent No. 7,155,479) (“Cover 479”). Applicants respectively traverse.

A. Applicants’ Presently Claimed Invention

Applicants’ presently claimed invention is generally directed to a method and a system, which allows the integration of email-enabled devices into a carrier service network without the need for user individual configuration of the devices. A system with an email proxy and a database is provided for handling email requests from a terminal. The network address of the terminal is used to retrieve email configuration settings from the database. The email proxy is able to communicate with an email server using the retrieved email configuration settings. Applicants’ Abstract.

Applicants’ presently pending claims are generally directed to such a method and system. For example, Applicants’ presently pending independent claim 1 expressly recites a system for handling email requests for sending and receiving email from a terminal. According to independent claim 1, the system comprises at least one email proxy and a database. The email proxy is arranged to communicate with the database. The email proxy is arranged to detect a network address of the terminal and retrieve email configuration settings from the database using the network address of the terminal. The email proxy is also arranged to communicate with an email server using the retrieved email configuration settings.

Applicants' note that this revised independent claim has been clarified to now expressly recite that the email requests are for "sending and receiving email from a terminal," that the system comprises "at least one" email proxy, and that the system uses the "retrieved" email configuration settings. Applicants' remaining independent claims recite similar limitations.

B. Cover 497 Does Not Anticipate Applicants' Presently Pending Claims

Cover 497 does not anticipate Applicants' presently pending claims. Unlike Applicants' presently claimed invention generally directed to a method and a system that allows the integration of email-enabled devices into a carrier service network without the need for user individual configuration of the devices, Cover 497 appears generally directed to a requesting computer system that accesses an identifier, which is representative of certain services. Cover 479 Abstract.

The presently pending Office Action states that "Cover discloses a system for handling email requests from a terminal" relying on Cover 479 Col. 4, lines 51-61. Applicants respectively traverse. Cover 479 at Col. 4, lines 40-61 discloses that in response to a request from a consuming computer system for configuration information, a configuration computer system identifies and sends appropriate configuration information to a consuming computer system. The configuration information can be used to configure modules that consume network services.

As such, Cover 479 fails to disclose or even suggest (let alone mention) a system for handling email requests, let alone email requests from a terminal. As used in Applicants' specification and as discussed in greater detail above, Applicants' term "email requests" relates to "requests for sending or retrieving email." The term "email requests" does not refer to

“requests for configuration information” as that the term “request” appears to be used in Cover 479.

In addition, the present Office Action states that, in relying on Col. 7, lines 14 – 220 [sic], Cover 479 teaches “an email proxy.” Applicants again respectively traverse. First, and most importantly, Applicants note that the term “email proxy” never even appears in this relied upon passage of Cover 479. Naturally, therefore, the relied upon citation to Cover 479 is not even remotely concerned with an “email proxy arranged to communicate with a database,” let alone an “email proxy arranged to communicate with a database,” to detect a network address as expressly recited in Applicants’ presently pending claims.

Moreover, Cover 479 at Col. 7 line 20, is the only line where the term ‘proxies’ is used. Proxies, routers, gateways, firewalls are given as an example of components that implement the principles of the purported system and method of Cover 479. These components, however, are very general and well known components of most commonly known communications networks and in Cover 479 it does not become clear how these components specifically relate to the invention disclosed in Cover 479. A special type of proxy, such as the email proxy referred to in Applicants’ specification and as explained above, is neither disclosed nor referred to in Cover 479.

At Col 7 lines 55-64, Cover 479 purports to disclose that a configuration computer system 202 may contain configuration information in a database, the database being included in the configuration computer system. Moreover, at Col 2 line 61-col. 3 line 22, Cover 479 discloses that a requesting computer system automatically causes a search for configuration information associated with services that will be consumed by modules included in the consuming computer system. This search maybe caused by the requesting computer system pushing an identifier to a

configuration computer system that includes configuration information. The searched configuration information is accessed and subsequently sent to a consuming computer system. Since Applicants' presently claimed "email proxy" is a totally different system than, and acting completely differently from, the configuration computer system used in Cover 479, the passage in Cover 479 (Col 2 line 61-col. 3 line 22) relied upon in the present Office Action neither discloses nor suggests an email proxy arranged to communicate with a database.

The present Office Action also suggests that, at Col 2 lines 41-60, Cover 479 purports to disclose an "email proxy arranged to detect a network address of the terminal." However, at the relied upon portion of this reference, Cover 479 discloses how an identifier is accessed by a requesting computer system. According to Cover 479, the identifier may include an email address or portions of the email address. Purportedly, the receipt of the identifier by a configuration computer system may cause the transport of configuration information to the consuming computer system, where it is being used for configure the modules that consume network services. The requesting computer system may be the same as the consuming computer system.

From these cited portions of Cover 479, it can be understood that both systems are however different from the configuration computer system. The configuration computer system according to Cover 479 does not use configuration information to configure modules inside the configuration computer system itself. Therefore, Applicants respectively suggest, that even if an attempt would be made to construe Applicants' claim in a way that the configuration computer system is equivalent to an email proxy (to which Applicants strongly disagree), the presently claimed invention would still be different from the one disclosed in Cover 479 as the configuration information discussed in Cover 479 is sent to a consuming computer system. This

does not occur in Applicant's system where the so called "configuration information" is used by an email proxy (configuration computer system) itself, to be able to consume network services.

Another principal difference is that Cover 479 relates to remote and automated configuration of a service consuming module (client). This is unlike Applicants' presently claimed invention that relates to the consumption of services without the need for user specific configuring the so called consuming module, by making use of a specific proxy functionality in the network.

Cover 479 also teaches how configuration information is requested, and subsequently sent to a consuming system/module to (automatically) configure it for using a service. *See, e.g.*, Cover 479 Col. 6, lines 54-60. Therefore, according to Cover 479, it can be understood that a consuming module is a module residing on a user terminal and is not a server application residing with the service provider. *See, also* Cover 479 Col. 10, lines 21-54 and 51-54. In Applicants' presently claimed invention, neither configuration information is requested, nor is it sent to a consuming system/module where it is used for configuring such a consuming system/module as taught and suggested in Cover 479. In fact, in Cover 479, the configuration of the consuming system/module remains unchanged with the standard preconfigured settings.

To anticipate a claim, "each and every element set forth in the claim [must be] found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single . . . reference." *Vergall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (M.P.E.P. Section 2131). Consequently, since Cover 479 does not teach or suggest "a system for handling email requests," Cover 479 simply also does not teach or suggest utilizing "a system for handling email requests for sending and receiving email from a terminal." Naturally, therefore, Cover 479 fails to teach or suggest "at least one email proxy and a database, the email proxy being arranged to communicate with

the database.” Consequently, Independent Claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 are allowable for at least all of the reasons stated above. The remaining claims are all dependent on these allowable independent claims and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

If there are any matters that may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: September 3, 2008

By: /Thomas E. Wettermann/
Thomas E. Wettermann
Reg. No. 41,523